Case 3:14-cr-00644-EMC Document 5 Filed 12/22/14 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR	14 0644	EMC	
Plaintiff, v.)	STIPULATED UNDER THE S	ORDER EXCI SPEEDY TRIA	LACT ED	
TACK PAPKE DAI, Defendani.	y }		RIC CLE NOOTE	DEC 222014 HARD W. WIEKING	
Defendant. For the reasons stated by the parties of Speedy Trial Act from 12/22 by the continuance outweigh the best 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this	on the record on 12/2, 2014 to 12/2	and the defendar	nd finds that that the	rial. See 18 U.S.C. §	
Failure to grant a cont See 18 U.S.C. § 31610		ely to result in a r	niscarriage of j	ustice.	
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).					
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).					
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).					
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 22 Dec 14		Slmar BERNARD ZI	Sim MMERMAN	mm	
STIPULATED: Attorney for	Defendant	United States N			